

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 26, 2009, rejected all pending claims 1-26. Applicants above have canceled claims 1-17, have amended claims 18-26, and have added new claims 27-32. As such, claims 18-32 are pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Specification

The specification was objected to for allegedly failing to provide antecedent basis for the recited "computer readable medium" of claim 26. Applicants respectfully disagree, and refer to page 30, lines 16-18 of the specification as originally filed, which states: "In certain implementations, computer-readable media are provided to the AAP for use in performing various of the methods of operation described above. These computer-readable media contain computer-executable instructions for performing these methods of operation."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be removed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 101

Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 on the grounds that the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-17 have been canceled, and thus the rejection of those claims is moot. With respect to independent claim 18 and its dependent claims 19-25, no reason is given for the rejection of these claims, and as such, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection under Section 101 of these claims be removed. Finally with respect to independent claim 26, Applicants have amended the claim to be directed to computer-readable storage medium, and thus submit that there can be no debate that this claim is directed to statutory subject matter. In addition, for the reasons discussed above in connection with the objection to the specification, the specification provides antecedent basis support for the computer-readable medium.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims under Section 101 be removed.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 13-20 and 22-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hornick et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,865,573) (“Hornick”). The remaining dependent claims 8, 12 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hornick in view of Lane et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0162812).

Applicants have canceled claims 1-17, and have amended the remaining two independent claims 18 and 26 to define more particularly the subject matter sought to be patented. Dependent claims 19-25 have been amended for consistency. The amendments add no new matter. Support for the amendments appear in the present specification as originally filed, for example, at page 5, line 9 through page 9, line 3 (and corresponding Figures 1A-1C); and at page 22, line 15 through page 24, line 16 (and corresponding Figure 7A).

Applicants submit that independent claims 18 and 26 define subject matter that is patentable over Hornick, as do the claims which depend from claims 18 and 26. For example, Hornick discloses an application programming interface for providing data mining functionality. (Abstract.) As shown in Figure 5 referenced in the Office Action, Hornick discloses client input 403 being input to prediction setup step 502. (Col. 5, lines 52-53.) Hornick discloses that the prediction setup step 502 uses input user data and desired results data to select and/or generate prediction parameters 510, and to select a model for use in scoring step 504. (Col. 6, lines 3-9.) Hornick discloses that the selected model 514, prediction parameters 510, and scoring data 508 are input to a scoring step 504. (Col. 6, lines 14-15.) Hornick discloses that in the scoring step 504, scoring data 408 are processed according to the selected model 514, as controlled by the prediction parameters 510, to generate one or more scores using model 514. (Col. 6, line 15-18.)

Hornick does not anticipate or render obvious the computer implemented method of Applicants' claim 18, as amended. For example, Hornick does not disclose or suggest a method that includes many of the recited aspects of claim 18, including “determining, from task definition configuration data that define the preconfigured analytical task, that a predecessor analytical task needs to be executed as part of the preconfigured analytical task,” “invoking execution of the predecessor analytical task on a first analytical engine, the first analytical engine being identified by the task definition configuration data, and receiving from the first analytical engine a value for an output field of the predecessor analytical task,” “determining, from the task definition configuration data, that a second analytical task needs to be executed as part of the

preconfigured analytical task, the execution of the second analytical task requiring, as an input field, the output field of the predecessor analytical task,” and “invoking execution of the second analytical task on a second analytical engine, the second analytical engine being identified by the task definition configuration data, sending to the second analytical engine the value for the output field of the predecessor analytical task received from the first analytical engine, and receiving from the second analytical engine a value for an output field of the second analytical task.”

The method of claim 18 is a method that operates within a specific framework defined in claim 18, namely a framework that defines a preconfigured analytical task, and specifically, defines for that analytical task that 1) a predecessor analytical task that needs to be executed on a first analytical engine, and 2) a second analytical task that needs to be executed on a second analytical engine using the output of the predecessor analytical task. In addition, the framework defines the specific analytical engine that is to be used for each of these analytical tasks. Such a framework allows an analytical task to be easily defined that includes a “chaining” of multiple different analytical engines, for example, a “key performance indicator” look-up analytical task and a prediction task. From the perspective of the front-end software application system, the different analytical tasks that make up a preconfigured analytical task and the specific analytical engines that execute each of those analytical tasks need not be known, and may be defined and changed in the task definition configuration data without any change to the front-end software application system. That recited framework is neither disclosed nor suggested by Hornick or any other reference of record, and affords advantages not disclosed or suggested by Hornick.

As such, claim 18 defines subject matter that is patentable over Hornick and Lane, as do dependent claims 19-25. In addition, independent claim 26 is patentable over Hornick and Lane at least for the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection of claims 18-26 be removed.

New claims 27-32

Applicants have added new claims to claim more completely the subject matter of the present application. The added claims add no new matter. Support for the newly added dependent claims appear in the specification as originally filed, for example, in originally filed

dependent claims 19-25. Because independent claim 26 is patentable for the reasons described above, Applicants submit that the newly added dependent claims 19-25 are patentable as well.

Conclusion


Applicants submit that claims 18-32 are in condition for allowance, and request that a notice of allowance be issued.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fee is believed to be due for the present amendment. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

June 26, 2009 

Stephen R. Schaefer
Reg. No. 37,927

Fish & Richardson P.C.
3200 RBC Plaza
60 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945